



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,122	09/23/2003	David Patron	1033-T00539	2884
84326 7590 06/02/2009 AT & T LEGAL DEPARTMENT - Toler ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING ROOM 2A-207 ONE AT & T WAY BEDMINISTER, NJ 07921			EXAMINER KARIKARI, KWASI	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/02/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/669,122

Applicant(s)

PATRON ET AL.

Examiner

KWASI KARIKARI

Art Unit

2617

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 13-20 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, filed on 04/20/2009 with respect to claims 1-9 and 13-20 in the remarks, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-9 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deshpande et al. (U.S. 20020176579 A1), (hereinafter Deshpande) in view of Barriga-Caceres et al., (US 20030163733), (hereinafter Barriga) and further in view of Kennedy et al., (US 6,084,967), (hereinafter, Kennedy).

Regarding claims 1, 7 and 13, Deshpande discloses a network access system/program comprising:

a network access hub (= hotspot access point 20 or 30, see Fig. 1) communicatively coupled to a global communications network (= hotspot service provider network; and any other connected networks such as internet, see [0019]) and the network access hub (= access point 20 or 30) communicatively connectable to a computing device (= mobile wireless device 40, see [0020] and Fig. 1) the network access hub operable to receive an initial set of credentials from a user via the computing device (= user is required to provide identification such as user name, password or IMSI, see [0025-26]);

an authentication engine (= user is authorized via authentication server 50 for access to the hotspot service provider's services, see [0025]) communicatively coupled to the network access hub via and the global communications network; and authentication engine operable to receive the initial set of credentials of the user from the network access hub and operable to authenticate the initial set of credentials and an authorization engine (= user is authorized via authentication server 50 for access to the hotspot service provider's services, see [0025]), operable to issue the computing device a grant of access rights (= access privileges, see [0022]) to both transport service (= user may registers with access point; and makes high bandwidth connection to internet, see [0020-21]) and federated data services of federated data service providers (= user may accept e-mail and other services once authorized; and authorization with another access point will not require the user to supply identification and/or

authentication information for access to services, see [0022, 0025 and 0034]) via the global communications network and the network access hub in response to the authentication of the initial set of credentials (= user is authorized via authentication server 50 for access to the hotspot service provider's services, see [0025]), authorize access of the user to both the transport services and the federated data services of the federated data service without the user having to provide the initial set of credentials to re- authenticate with the federated service providers (= authorization with another access point will not require the user to supply identification and/or authentication information for access to services, see [0025 and 0034]; wherein the user connection to the access point and internet, is being associated with "transport service"; and the user's authorization to access hotspot service provider's services via another access point without the supply of user identification, is being associated with the "federated service").

Although Deshpande mentions access privileges upon authorization; and the user's authorization to access hotspot service provider's services via another access point without the supply of user identification (see [0022 and 0025]), Deshpande explicitly fails to mention "third party federated data service providers" and a "token".

Barriga, which is an analogous art, mentions a system that includes Federation of Service Providers; a Single Sign-on Services (SSO) for subscribers of Federation of Mobile Network Operator; users having the advantage of the SSO service can access any service at any Service Provider (SP) within the reference model agreement; the Mobile Network Operators (MNO) may obtain revenues by offering SSO services, in

particular authentication and authorization, to third parties; and authentication and authorization via AAA server 44 (see [0003, 0010-11, 0017 0022-25, 0044 and 0100-0101]). **Barriga** also teaches digital certificates, token, cookies and artifact that include user authentication identity (see, [0007, 0020, 0066-70, 0103 and 0106-108]; whereby the digital certificates, token, cookies and artifact are an example of the "token").

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Barriga with the system of Deshpande for the benefit of achieving a federated single sign-on network (see Barriga, [0025]).

The combination of **Deshpande and Barriga** fails to mention that "the initial set of credentials includes biometric user information".

However, **Kennedy**, which is an analogous art, equivalently teaches "the initial set of credentials includes biometric user information" (= biometric of a person is used to verify or authenticate identification of system user, see col. 1, lines 34-42; and col. 2, line 55- col. 3, line 6).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Kennedy in the system of Deshpande and Barriga for the benefit of achieving a communication network that uses biometric information of user for authentication purposes.

Regarding claim 2, as recited in claim 1, Deshpande further discloses that the system further comprising a short-range wireless transceiver associated with the first network access hub (see, [0002 and 0020]).

Regarding claim 3, as recited in claim 2, Deshpande further discloses the system, wherein the transport services comprise wireless communication via a wireless local area network technology link (see, [0021]).

Regarding claim 4, as recited in claim 3, Deshpande further discloses the system, wherein the data services comprise a service that provides personalized information based on an identity of the user (see, [0025-26]).

Regarding claim 5, as recited in claim 4, Deshpande discloses the system, wherein the federated data services (= upon authentication, handshaking with another access point will not require the user to supply identification and/or authentication information for access to services, see [0019, 0025 and 0034]); but the combination of Deshpande and Kennedy fails to mention that the federated system includes first federated data service provided by a first third party federated service provider, and a second third party federated data service provided by a second federated service provider.

However, Barriga, which is an analogous art, mentions the federated system includes first federated data service provided by a first third party federated service provider, and a second third party federated data service provided by a second federated service provider (= system that includes Federation of Service Providers; a Single Sign-on Services (SSO) for subscribers of Federation of Mobile Network Operator; users having the advantage of the SSO service can access any service at any Service Provider (SP) within the reference model agreement; the Mobile Network

Operators (MNO) may obtain revenues by offering SSO services, in particular authentication and authorization, to third parties; and authentication and authorization via AAA server 44 (see [0003, 0010-11, 0017, 0022-25, 0044 and 0100-0101]).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Barriga with the system of Deshpande and Kennedy for the benefit of achieving a federated single sign-on network (see Barriga, [0025]).

Regarding claim 6, as recited in claim 5, the combination of Deshpande and Kennedy explicitly fails to disclose that the system, further comprising “a federation engine operable to maintain information that indicates members of a service provider federation, the service provider federation comprising the first third party federated service provider and the second third party federated service provider”.

However, Barriga teaches “a federation engine operable to maintain information that indicates members of a service provider federation, the service provider federation comprising the first third party federated service provider and the second third party federated service provider” (see, [0009-11, 0019, 0022-25, 0028, 0044 and 0066-70]).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Barriga with the system of Deshpande and Kennedy for the benefit of achieving a federated single sign-on network (see Barriga, [0025]).

Regarding claim 8, as recited in claim 7, Deshpande discloses that the method further comprising: receiving a request for access to the federated network data service from

an electronic device (see, [0025 and 0034]); prompting the electronic device to send the first set of credentials (= PIN, password) (see, [0020 and 0025]).

Regarding claim 9, as recited in claim 8, Deshpande discloses that the method further comprising: receiving a subsequent request for access to a second federated network data service of a second federated data service provider from the electronic device; and authorizing access to the second federated network data service of the second federated data service provider in response to the subsequent request without the user having to provide the initial set of credentials to re-authenticate with the second federated service provider (= upon authentication and authorization, handshaking with another access point will not require the user to supply identification and/or authentication information for access to services, see [0019, 0025 and 0034]); but the combination of Deshpande and Kennedy fails to mention “requesting that the electronic device cache the **token** and recognizing an existence of the **token** at the electronic device” and “third party federated data service providers”.

Barriga, which is an analogous art, mentions a system that includes Federation of Service Providers; a Single Sign-on Services (SSO) for subscribers of Federation of Mobile Network Operator; users having the advantage of the SSO service can access any service at any Service Provider (SP) within the reference model agreement; the Mobile Network Operators (MNO) may obtain revenues by offering SSO services, in particular authentication and authorization, to third parties; and authentication and authorization via AAA server 44 (see [0003, 0010-11, 0017 0022-25, 0044 and 0100-

0101)). Barriga also teaches digital certificates, token, cookies and artifact that include user authentication identity (see, [0007, 0020, 0066-70, 0103 and 0106-108]; whereby the digital certificates, token, cookies and artifact are an example of the "token").

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Barriga with the system of Deshpande and Kennedy for the benefit of achieving a federated single sign-on network (see Barriga, [0025]).

Regarding claim 14, as recited in claim 13, Deshpande mentions access privileges upon authorization (see [0022]), however, the combination of Deshpande and Kennedy explicitly fails to mention the system wherein the electronic device includes a cache operable to store the token.

Barriga, which is an analogous art, mentions a system that includes Single Sign-on Services (SSO) for subscribers of Federation of Mobile Network Operator and authentication and authorization via AAA server 44 (see [0003, 0010-11, 0017 0022-25 0044 and 0100-0101]). Barriga also teaches digital certificates, token and artifact (see, [0007, 0020, 0066-70 and 0106-08]).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Barriga with the system of Deshpande and Kennedy for the benefit of achieving a federated single sign-on network (see Barriga, [0025]).

Regarding claim 15, as recited in claim 13, Deshpande discloses access rights to both transport services and data services at a second hotspot of the plurality of hotspots

(= access privileges, see Pars. [0022, 0025, 0034, 0037 and 042-43]); but the combination of Deshpande and Kennedy fails to mention a token.

Barriga, which is an analogous art, mentions a system that includes Single Sign-on Services (SSO) for subscribers of Federation of Mobile Network Operator and authentication and authorization via AAA server 44 (see [0003, 0010-11, 0017 0022-25 0044 and 0100-0101]). Barriga also teaches digital certificates, token and artifact (see, [0007, 0020, 0066-70 and 0106-08]).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Barriga with the system of Deshpande and Kennedy for the benefit of achieving a federated single sign-on network (see Barriga, [0025]).

Regarding claim 16, as recited in claim 13, Deshpande discloses that the system, further comprising: an authentication engine communicatively coupled to the broad communications network and operable to receive an initial set of credentials from a user, the authentication engine (= authorization and authentication, see [0019 and 0024-25]) further operable to compare the initial set of credentials against a maintained set of credentials and to output a valid signal indicating that the user is a valid user (see , [0022, 0024-25 and 0034]); but the combination of Deshpande and Kennedy fails to mention and a “federation engine operable to initiate a sharing of information associated with the valid user with a first third party federated data service provider”.

However, Barriga teaches “federation engine operable to initiate a sharing of information associated with the valid user with a first third party federated data service provider” (see Pars. 0009-11, 0022-25, 00280047-48 and 0066-70).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Barriga with the system of Deshpande and Kennedy for the benefit of achieving a federated single sign-on network (see Barriga, Par. 0025).

Regarding **claim 17**, as recited in claim 13, Deshpande discloses that the system, further comprising:

an authentication engine communicatively coupled to the broad communications network and operable to output a valid signal indicating that a user requesting access is a valid user and entitled to transport and data service access (see, [0019, 0025, 0034 and 0037]); but the combination of Deshpande and Kennedy fails to teach “a federation engine operable to initiate a sharing of at least a portion of a valid user information with a first third party federated data service provider, the valid user information to facilitate access to a federated data service without additional sign on operations by the user requesting access”.

However, Barriga teaches “a federation engine operable to initiate a sharing of at least a portion of a valid user information with a first third party federated data service provider, the valid user information to facilitate access to a federated data service without additional sign on operations by the user requesting access” (see, [0009-11, 0022-25, 00280047-48 and 0066-70]).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Barriga with the system of Deshpande and Kennedy for the benefit of achieving a federated single sign-on network (see Barriga, [0025]).

Regarding **claim 18**, as recited in claim 13, Deshpande discloses the system, wherein the data service comprises a unified messaging mailbox (see, [0019 and 0041]).

Regarding **claim 19**, as recited in claim 13, Deshpande discloses the system, wherein the transport service comprises access to the broad communication network via at least the first hotspot of the plurality of hotspots (see, [0019, 0025 and 0034] and Fig. 2).

Regarding **claim 20**, as recited in claim 19, Deshpande discloses that the system, further comprising:

an authentication engine communicatively coupled to the broad communications network and operable to output a valid signal indicating that a user requesting access is a valid user and entitled to transport and data service access (0037); but the combination of Deshpande and Kennedy fails to teach "a federation engine operable to initiate a sharing of at least a portion of valid user information with a first third party federated data service provider, the valid user information operable to facilitate access to a federated data service without additional sign on operations by the user requesting access".

However, Barriga teaches "a federation engine operable to initiate a sharing of at least a portion of valid user information with a first third party federated data service provider, the valid user information operable to facilitate access to a federated data service without additional sign on operations by the user requesting access" (= single sign-on and federation, see Pars. 0009-11, 0022-25, 00280047-48 and 0066-70).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Barriga with the system of Deshpande and Kennedy for the benefit of achieving a federated single sign-on network (see Barriga, Par. 0025).

CONCLUSION

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached form PTO-892 for cited references and the prior art made of record.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. **SEE MPEP 2141.02 [R-5] VI. PRIOR ART MUST BE CONSIDERED IN ITS ENTIRETY, INCLUDING DISCLOSURES THAT TEACH AWAY FROM THE CLAIMS:** A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. W.L. Gore &

Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984) In re Fulton, 391 F.3d 1195, 1201, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004). >See also MPEP §2123.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kwasi Karikari whose telephone number is 571-272-8566. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (9am - 7pm). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on 571-272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8566. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2617

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Kwasi Karikari/

Patent Examiner: Art Unit 2617.

/Charles N. Appiah/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617